

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS FO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.tepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/765,720	01/26/2004	Gilad Odinak	INTL-1-1039	2555
25315 BLACK LOW	7590 09/01/2010 E & GRAHAM, PLLC	EXAMINER		
701 FIFTH AVENUE			ZEWARI, SAYED T	
SUITE 4800 SEATTLE, WA 98104			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SLATILL, W	A 30104		2617	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/01/2010	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing-patent@blacklaw.com blgdocketing@blacklaw.com

## **Advisory Action** Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/765,720	ODINAK, GILAD		
Examiner	Art Unit		
SAYED T. ZEWARI	2617		

	SAYED T. ZEWARI	2617						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address								
THE REPLY FILED 09 August 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:								
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b)  The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on; (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is								
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.								
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(	f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropri- nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee te action; or (2) as					
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the						
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>								
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I</li> <li>They raise new issues that would require further control in the proposed in the proposed</li></ol>	nsideration and/or search (see NO	will <u>not</u> be entered be ΓE below);	cause					
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet		ducing or simplifying t	he issues for					
appeal; and/or  (d) They present additional claims without canceling a ( NOTE:	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.116	21 See attached Notice of Non-Co	mnliant Amendment (	PTOL-324)					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		Inpliant Americanent (	1 101-324).					
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the					
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		I be entered and an e	xplanation of					
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:								
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>								
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar</li> </ol>	vercome all rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a					
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.					
The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:					
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)							
13. Other:								
# ECTED KINGAID!								

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant argues that

"Larsson teaches that during the time at which the tandem of phone 100 and kit 160 are in communication with the cellular system (i.e., in a communication session with a wireless network), the phone 100 and kit are in communication with each other. Only at step 30, "after the communication is finished," that is, after the phone/kit tandem cease communicating with the cellular system, do the phone 100 and kit 160 end communication with each other."

This argument is not persuasive because the applicant is arguing the against references separately. Larsson does not disclose the above limitation and that is why another reference, Khullar, was provided. Khullar discloses the above limitation of ending communication between the mobile and embedded phone.

Applicant argues that

"Khullar fails to supply the teachings missing from Larsson, namely ending communication between a personal mobile phone and an embedded phone, and after ending the communication, opening a communication session between the embedded phone and a wireless network based on a sent confirmation."

This argument is not persuasive. Khullar was provided to meet the limitation of ending communication and Khullar meets this limitation. Khullar meets this limitation by disabling a transceiver.